

United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington
Magistrate Judge Mary K. Dimke
Yakima

USA v. ROMAN BERUMEN PEREZ Case No. 2:21-2009-SAB-2

Yakima Video Conference
The Defendant agreed to appear via video conference.

Arraignment on Indictment and Defendant's Oral Motion to Reopen Detention Hearing 02/17/2021

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Howard, Courtroom Deputy [Y]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ian Garriques, US Atty (video)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erica Helms, US Probation / Pretrial Services Officer (tele)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Smith, Defense Atty (video)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody USM appearing by video from Yakima County Jail	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter – Susan Evans (video)
<hr/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rights given	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment of Rights filed	<input type="checkbox"/> Conditions of release imposed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant received copy of charging document	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant waived reading of charging document	
<input type="checkbox"/> Charging document read in open court	

REMARKS

Due to the current COVID-19 public health crisis, all parties including Defendant, appeared by video or teleconference.

Defendant appeared and was assisted by counsel and advised of their rights and the allegations contained in the charging document.

The Defendant acknowledged to the Court that their true and correct name is: ROMAN PEREZ BERUMEN.

“Not guilty” plea entered.

Discovery to be provided pursuant to the local rule on discovery.

Defense counsel argued why the Defendant should be released including a lesser possible penalty if convicted on the Indictment then was indicated on the Complaint. Defense proposes a surety to the Court for a possible posting of a financial bond.

Court colloquy with Defense regarding the criminal history of the proposed surety.

Defense counsel responds that Defendant’s son could possibly post the bond.

Court responds Defendant’s son also has a pending failure to appear for a court hearing and would not be an appropriate surety either.

The Court ordered:

1. Defense Motion to Reopen Detention is **denied**; subject to right to return before the Court should circumstances change.

2. Defendant shall be detained by the U.S. Marshal until further order of the Court.